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Reviewer's report:

General

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

It is still unclear why the HTA review found no randomised studies but the Cochrane one found 15. The last sentence of the section relating to this in the introduction does not make sense “found no randomised comparisons of different strategies, only evaluations of effectiveness of methods” ??

Please be consistent about wording of the effect of the interventions “ in places you make it clear that a difference is statistically significant but not in others

Use of a variety of terms in table 1 “ recruited/participated/enrolled/randomised “ do these all mean the same “ or are there subtle differences?

forest does not have a capital F

The first RCTs excluded box in figure one still contains 2 categories which seem to be the same “ the 1st and the 3rd in the box

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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